

University of Southern Queensland



Identifying strategies to improve the water productivity of permanent raised beds

A dissertation submitted by

Ghani Akbar

FOR THE AWARD OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

2013

ABSTRACT

Permanent raised bed (PRB) farming systems combine several elements (e.g. reduced tillage, controlled traffic, stubble retention) of conservation agriculture. PRB systems have recently been introduced into irrigated areas but there is a lack of information on the agronomic and irrigation performance of these systems under these conditions. Three years of field research into the performance of irrigated PRBs was conducted in south east Queensland, Australia and north west Pakistan. These studies benchmarked the irrigation performance of variously sized PRB systems and explored the impact of bed renovation method (no tillage (NT), shallow cultivation (SC) and blade ploughing (BP)) on soil hydro-physical properties (bulk density, soil moisture storage, infiltration), irrigation performance, crop yield and input water productivity (*WP*). Irrigation management strategies to improve lateral infiltration and irrigation performance were also investigated.

The initial benchmarking study was conducted on two farms with clayey Vertisol (Australia) and three farms with sandy clay loam, Alfisol, (Pakistan) soils. The results showed low irrigation performance with excessive deep drainage potential. The irrigation application efficiency (*Ea*) on the clayey Vertisol and sandy clay loam was as low as 68% and 50%, requirement efficiency (*Er*) 96% and 77% and distribution uniformity (*DU*) 86% and 66%, respectively. However, the majority of the narrow beds (66 cm furrow spacing) were over-irrigated on the sandy clay loam while the wide beds (132 cm furrow spacing) were under-irrigated. Inappropriate renovation and bed furrow dimensions, sub-optimal irrigation management and poor lateral infiltration were the main factors likely to affect *WP* of irrigated PRBs.

The evaluation of bed renovation methods found that BP on the clayey Vertisol reduced (~6%) the average seasonal bulk density of the surface 0-30 cm compared to the NT treatment. BP was found to produce higher lateral infiltration into the beds than either NT or SC. Freshly applied BP and SC produced a higher (~23%) cumulative infiltration than NT but the effect was transient and was not significant in the following season when the PRB renovation treatments were not freshly applied. The SC beds slump more than the BP and NT beds. The soil water content in the beds indicated that there was increased water storage associated with BP.

PRB renovation (i.e. SC or BP) was found to reduce irrigation performance on the clayey Vertisol when the irrigation was farmer managed. The volume of irrigation water applied to the fresh SC and BP treatments increased by up to 13% and 55%, and *Ea* was reduced by up to 9% and 29% respectively, compared with NT during the 2010 wheat and 2011 corn seasons. NT produced a higher wheat yield and *WP*, but the lower wheat yield in the cultivated treatments was associated with poor crop establishment from a rough soil surface and inadequate seeder performance in this season. In the subsequent seasons, there was no significant difference in either the crop yields or *WP* between the bed renovation treatments.

Field trials investigating the effect of bed renovation on infiltration were conducted on both soils. Significant differences in the amount of water infiltrated and stored in the bed shoulder and bed middle were found for periods of wetting consistent with normal irrigation practices. This suggests that the general assumption of uniform soil moisture distribution across the beds is not valid for wide PRB systems. The three different renovation methods also significantly affected lateral infiltration, suggesting tillage may be used as a management tool to improve bed wetting in low infiltration soils and subsided beds.

Infiltration and soil-water movement were simulated using Hydrus 2D. The simulations were found to be well correlated with the measured field data and an evaluation for the three PRB renovation methods confirmed that NT had the slowest, and BP the fastest, potential to wet the bed middle of the wide PRBs. Increasing the furrow water head from 4 cm to furrow full of water was also shown to reduce wetting time by more than 30%.

Lateral infiltration was poor in the sandy clay loam. The shortest wetting time (~15 hrs) required to wet the bed middle of a 132 cm wide bed to field capacity occurred when furrow full water head was applied to the BP treated bed. However, even this period of wetting may be difficult to achieve using current irrigation practices in Pakistan. The graphical model outputs developed can be used in developing guidelines to optimise bed width and irrigation management to ensure adequate lateral infiltration with different PRB renovation methods.

Strategies to optimise irrigation management and field design while ensuring adequate lateral infiltration into the bed middle were evaluated using the surface irrigation model SIRMOD. Optimising the inflow rate (Q) and the time to cut-off (Tco) for the particular field length was found to produce up to a 38% irrigation water saving compared with existing practices. However, the majority of the wide beds on the sandy clay loam required higher inflow volumes than currently applied, which increased Er but reduced Ea . Optimising furrow length indicated a further improvement in irrigation performance. Similarly, Q and Tco optimisation together showed up to 35% irrigation water saving and up to 33% improved Ea for the most sub-optimally managed BP treatment. Decreased furrow length improved irrigation performance for freshly renovated PRB, while irrigation performance of settled bed furrows tended to increase with increased furrow length. Relating optimum Tco to water advance to furrow tail end (Ta) was sensitive to furrow length, Q and soil infiltration functions. The decision support guidelines developed were helpful in improving existing irrigation performance under both soil conditions.

This research has shown that the existing irrigation performance of PRBs is often low and highly variable. A key constraint is the potential for poor lateral infiltration into the beds and inadequate wetting to the centre of wide beds. However, this work has also highlighted that the adoption of appropriate bed renovation methods (particularly BP) and irrigation management practices (e.g. Q and Tco) can substantially improve irrigation performance and input WP . Although the applicability of the specific decision support tools developed is restricted to the soil types and field conditions encountered, the general understanding and insight into the basic principles of performance optimisation and for agronomic and irrigation interactions is expected to be beneficial in refining understanding and the promotion of sustainable crop production under a wider range of environmental conditions.

CERTIFICATION OF DISSERTATION

I certify that the ideas, designs, experimental work, software, results, analyses and conclusions presented in this dissertation are entirely my own effort, except where otherwise indicated and acknowledged.

I further certify that the work is original and has not been previously submitted for assessment in any other course or institution, except where specifically stated.

Signature of candidate

Date

Endorsement:

Professor Steven Raine (Principal supervisor)

Date

Dr Allen David McHugh (Associate supervisor)

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciations to a number of people who have helped me during this research. I am grateful to Professor Steven Raine for his timely supervision, guidance, academic, technical and personal support. I greatly admire his capabilities of quick assessment, which greatly benefited me in solving multiple technical, writing and field related issues. I particularly acknowledge the major assistance provided to me by Dr Allen (Jack) McHugh in technical support and in improving my presentation and writing capabilities. Never once did he turn me away in an unscheduled meeting when I needed help, and I know this was at the expense of his own workload. I am extremely thankful to Mr Greg Hamilton, who not only supported me in getting the PhD fellowship but continued to guide me throughout the duration of this work. I cannot forget his personal contribution and support in my career development.

I acknowledge the support of the Australian Centre for International Agriculture Research (ACIAR) for providing me a fellowship, the National Centre for Engineering and Agriculture (NCEA) at the University of Southern Queensland (USQ), and its friendly staff for providing me the necessary equipment, field conveyance and technical support. I acknowledge the Pakistan Agricultural Research Council (PARC) and my colleagues for their cooperation and all possible support.

I greatly appreciate my collaborative farmers, especially Mr David House (Cambooya, Australia) and Mr Feroz Shah (Mardan, north west Pakistan) for providing me field access and support in establishing the field trials. Many thanks to Dr Jochen Eberhard, Dr Malcolm Gillies, Dr Simon White, and Professor Shah Jahan Khan for their guidance, discussion, technical and statistical consultation support.

I wish to express my humble obligation to my mother, wife, two sons and one daughter for their love, prayers, support, motivation and patience. The physical support in crop sample handling, moral support and encouragement from my wife during the hard days of lengthy field work was always crucial in motivating me to accomplish this research study.

PUBLICATIONS ARISING FROM THIS RESEARCH

Akbar, G, Hamilton, GJ & Raine SR 2010, 'Permanent raised bed configurations and renovation methods affect crop performance', In: *19th World Congress on Soil Science*, August 2010, Brisbane Australia.

Akbar, G, McHugh, AD, Raine, SR & Hamilton GJ 2011, 'A preliminary evaluation of furrow inflow rate and cut-off time on the performance of smallholder raised bed farming systems', In: *World Congress on Conservation Agriculture*, September 2011, Brisbane Australia.

Akbar, G, Raine, SR, McHugh, AD & Hamilton GJ 2011, 'A preliminary evaluation of irrigation performance and in season changes under permanent raised beds on Vertisol in Queensland, Australia', In: *World Congress on Conservation Agriculture*, September 2011, Brisbane Australia.

Akbar, G, Raine, SR, McHugh, AD & Hamilton, GJ 2012, 'A soil management technique to enhance lateral infiltration (subbing) in permanent raised bed', In: *ICID Irrigation Australia Conference and Exhibition*, Adelaide Convention Centre, June 25-29, 2012, Adelaide Australia.

Akbar, G, Raine, SR, McHugh, AD & Hamilton, GJ 2012, 'Impact of renovating permanent raised beds on water productivity under Vertisol', In: *ICID Irrigation Australia Conference and Exhibition*, Adelaide Convention Centre, June 25-29, 2012, Adelaide Australia.

The following journal papers are in the final stages of review between the authors and are expected to be submitted in the near future:

Akbar, G, Raine, S, McHugh, AD & Hamilton, GJ 'Strategies to improve the irrigation performance of raised beds on small farms in north west Pakistan', will be submitted soon to *Water Resources Management Journal* (Springer).

Akbar, G, Raine, S, McHugh, AD & Hamilton GJ 'Impact on irrigation performance and productivity of permanent raised bed renovation methods on a Vertisol', will be submitted soon to *Crop and Pasture Science Journal* (CSIRO).

Akbar, G, Raine, S, McHugh, AD & Hamilton GJ "Modelling lateral infiltration under different renovation methods of permanent raised beds and furrow water heads in a Vertisol and a sandy clay loam", will be submitted to *Irrigation Science* (Springer).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
CERTIFICATION OF DISSERTATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
PUBLICATIONS ARISING FROM THIS RESEARCH	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	xii
LIST OF TABLES	xx
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxiii
LIST OF SYMBOLS	xxiv
 CHAPTER 1: Introduction.....	 1
1.1 Agricultural sustainability and food security	2
1.2 Water productivity	3
1.2.1 Agronomic management	4
1.2.2 Irrigation management	5
1.3 Research opportunities	6
1.4 Research question and aim	6
1.5 Hypotheses	7
1.6 Specific objectives	7
1.7 Structure of this dissertation	8
 CHAPTER 2: Review of permanent raised bed farming system performance ..	 10
2.1 Introduction	10
2.2 Need to improve water productivity of raised beds	10
2.2.1 Extent of agronomic and irrigation management issues	12
2.2.1.1 <i>Agronomic and irrigation issues in an Australian context</i>	12
2.2.1.2 <i>Agronomic and irrigation issues in a Pakistani context</i>	14
2.3 Factors affecting water productivity of raised beds	16
2.3.1 Agronomic management factors	17
2.3.1.1 <i>Machinery traffic and tillage</i>	17
2.3.1.2 <i>Bed furrow configurations</i>	19
2.3.1.3 <i>Cropping management</i>	20
2.3.1.4 <i>Waterlogging and salinity</i>	21
2.3.2 Irrigation management factors	22
2.3.2.1 <i>Inflow rate</i>	23
2.3.2.2 <i>Time to cut-off</i>	24
2.3.2.3 <i>Application depth and infiltration opportunity time</i>	25
2.3.2.4 <i>Field design</i>	26
2.3.2.5 <i>Irrigation scheduling</i>	27
2.4 Adaptation of conservation agriculture to raised beds	28
2.4.1 Permanent raised bed farming systems	29
2.4.1.1 <i>Review of permanent raised beds in Australia</i>	29

2.4.1.2	<i>Review of permanent raised beds in Pakistan.....</i>	32
2.4.1.3	<i>Summary of research needs in both countries</i>	33
2.5	Permanent raised beds performance and assessment	33
2.5.1	Agronomic management performance and assessment	34
2.5.1.1	<i>Soil texture and structure</i>	34
2.5.1.2	<i>Soil moisture</i>	34
2.5.1.3	<i>Bulk density</i>	36
2.5.1.4	<i>Hydraulic conductivity</i>	37
2.5.1.5	<i>Lateral infiltration into bed.....</i>	38
2.5.1.6	<i>Surface drainage and stability during wetness</i>	40
2.5.1.7	<i>Seasonal changes</i>	41
2.5.1.8	<i>Crop yield.....</i>	42
2.5.2	Irrigation management performance and assessment	43
2.5.2.1	<i>Models to assess irrigation performance.....</i>	43
2.6	Conclusions	50
CHAPTER 3: General material and methods.....		51
3.1	Introduction	51
3.2	Research plan	51
3.3	Description of field sites	52
3.4	General field conditions encountered in Australia.....	53
3.4.1	Site A1	53
3.4.2	Site A2.....	57
3.5	General field conditions encountered in Pakistan	58
3.6	Soil and irrigation measurement technique.....	61
3.6.1	Soil moisture, bulk density and soil moisture deficit.....	63
3.6.2	Lateral infiltration	63
3.6.3	Soil infiltration and irrigation performance	65
3.6.3.1	<i>IRRIMATETM equipment for irrigation performance evaluation...</i>	66
3.7	Statistical methods	66
CHAPTER 4: Benchmarking irrigation performance of permanent raised		67
beds		67
4.1	Introduction	67
4.2	Material and methods	67
4.2.1	Data collection and instruments used.....	69
4.2.1.1	<i>Australia.....</i>	69
4.2.1.2	<i>Pakistan.....</i>	70
4.3	Results	71
4.3.1	Field conditions and soil moisture deficit before irrigation	71
4.3.2	Bed furrow dimensions	72
4.3.3	Inflow, water advance and time to cut-off.	73
4.3.4	Infiltration	77
4.3.5	Irrigation performance	80
4.4	Discussion	82
4.4.1	Sites conditions and existing management	82
4.4.2	Renovation methods and irrigation performance interactions	84

4.4.3	Sites and irrigation performance interactions	85
4.4.4	Irrigation management and performance interactions.....	85
4.4.5	Performance improvement options of existing permanent raised beds .	87
4.5	Conclusions	88
CHAPTER 5: Impact of PRB renovation on irrigation performance and productivity.....		89
5.1	Introduction	89
5.2	Material and methods	89
5.2.1	Site description, treatments and experiment layout	89
5.2.2	Agronomic management practices	92
5.2.3	Sampling and instrumentation	93
5.2.4	Irrigation performance and water productivity	95
5.3	Results	97
5.3.1	Weather conditions.....	97
5.3.2	Observation of machinery operations	97
5.3.3	Effect of PRB renovation method on bed and soil properties.....	98
5.3.3.1	<i>Furrow dimensions</i>	98
5.3.3.2	<i>Bulk density</i>	100
5.3.3.3	<i>Soil moisture deficit and infiltration properties</i>	101
5.3.4	Water applied and profile water content	103
5.3.5	Effect of PRB renovation on irrigation characteristics	106
5.3.5.1	<i>Inflow</i>	106
5.3.5.2	<i>Irrigation performance</i>	106
5.3.6	Dry biomass yield	107
5.3.7	Water productivity	109
5.4	Discussion	111
5.4.1	Effect of PRB renovation methods on soil physical properties	111
5.4.2	Treatment, irrigation management and performance interactions	114
5.4.3	Treatment and crop yield interactions.....	116
5.4.4	Treatment and water productivity interaction	117
5.4.5	PRB renovation options for improved performance on a Vertisol	118
5.5	Conclusions	119
CHAPTER 6: Field evaluation of lateral infiltration in permanent raised beds		120
6.1	Introduction	120
6.2	Material and methods	121
6.2.1	Site description, treatment and experimental layout	121
6.2.2	Bulk density and soil moisture measurements	122
6.2.3	Blocked furrow infiltrometer measurements	124
6.2.4	Lateral infiltration and sorptivity	124
6.3	Results	125
6.3.1	Site A1-Vertisol	125
6.3.2	Site P4-Sandy Clay Loam	133

6.3.3	Field sorptivity	138
6.4	Discussion	139
6.4.1	Lateral infiltration on Vertisol	139
6.4.2	Lateral infiltration on sandy clay loam	141
6.5	Conclusions	143
CHAPTER 7: Strategies to improve lateral infiltration in permanent raised ...		
beds using Hydrus 2D		144
7.1	Introduction	144
7.2	Material and methods	144
7.3	Results	146
7.3.1	Hydrus calibration	146
7.3.2	Effect of renovation on infiltration with 9 cm furrow water head	146
7.3.2.1	<i>Lateral infiltration</i>	146
7.3.2.2	<i>Vertical infiltration</i>	147
7.3.3	Effect of furrow water head on soil moisture distribution	150
7.3.3.1	<i>Lateral wetting on bed surface</i>	150
7.3.3.2	<i>Vertical wetting below furrow centre</i>	151
7.3.3.3	<i>Cumulative infiltration</i>	152
7.3.3.4	<i>Soil water storage</i>	153
7.3.3.5	<i>Deep drainage losses</i>	155
7.3.3.6	<i>Soil moisture distribution for normal irrigation applications</i>	156
7.3.4	Implications of lateral infiltration for irrigation management	157
7.4	Discussion	160
7.4.1	Effect of renovation methods and furrow head on infiltration	160
7.4.2	Implications for irrigation management	162
7.5	Conclusions	163
CHAPTER 8: Managing irrigation and field design to improve performance...		
.....		164
8.1	Introduction	164
8.2	Material and methods	165
8.2.1	Irrigation management and field design optimisation protocol	166
8.3	Results	167
8.3.1	Optimising irrigation management of PRB systems in Australia	167
8.3.1.1	<i>Optimising time to cut-off</i>	168
8.3.1.2	<i>Optimising inflow rate and time to cut-off</i>	168
8.3.1.3	<i>Optimising furrow length</i>	169
8.3.1.4	<i>Optimising time to cut-off relative to water advance time</i>	170
8.3.2	Optimising irrigation management of PRB farming systems in Pakistan..	171
8.3.2.1	<i>Optimising time to cut-off</i>	172
8.3.2.2	<i>Optimising inflow rate and time to cut-off</i>	173
8.3.2.3	<i>Optimising furrow length</i>	175
8.3.2.4	<i>Optimising time to cut-off relative to water advance time</i>	176
8.3.3	Optimising irrigation management in response to PRB renovation	177
	methods on the Vertisol in Australia	177
8.3.3.1	<i>Optimising time to cut-off</i>	177

8.3.3.2	<i>Optimising inflow rate and time to cut-off.....</i>	177
8.3.3.3	<i>Optimising furrow length.....</i>	180
8.3.3.4	<i>Optimising time to cut-off relative to water advance time.....</i>	182
8.4	Discussion	183
8.4.1	Irrigation management practices of PRB systems in Australia.....	183
8.4.2	Irrigation management practices of PRB systems in Pakistan.....	184
8.4.3	Irrigation management practices in response to renovation methods ..	186
8.5	Conclusions	188
CHAPTER 9: General discussion and recommendations.....		189
9.1	Introduction	189
9.2	Major outcomes and key findings	190
9.2.1	Benchmarking irrigation performance of PRB farming systems	190
9.2.2	Impact of renovations on irrigation performance and productivity	191
9.2.3	Effect of renovation on lateral infiltration	193
9.2.4	Strategies to improve lateral infiltration and irrigation performance...	194
9.3	Summary	196
9.4	Practical implications of this research	197
9.5	Recommendations for further research	199
CHAPTER 10: Conclusions		200
References	203
Appendix A:	Specific field measured data.....	223
Appendix B:	IPARM and SIRMOD calibration.....	233
Appendix C:	EnviroSCAN and Micro-Gopher calibration validation.....	236
Appendix D:	Irrigation performance and optimisation for all sites and seasons	237
Appendix E:	Hydrus 2D calibration	244

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Frame work of management factors affecting water productivity of raised beds.....	7
Figure 1.2: Outline of dissertation structure	8
Figure 2.1: Bed cross section with three soil zones affecting irrigation and crop performance.....	16
Figure 2.2: Screen shot of IPARM version 2 main user interface	48
Figure 2.3: Screen shot of SIRMOD version III main output screen	49
Figure 3.1: General location of study sites in Australia and Pakistan on World map.....	53
Figure 3.2: Furrow spacing at (a) site A1 (b) site A2 and (c) Furrow dimension (TW: Top width, MW: Middle width, BW: Bottom width and D: furrow depth or bed height)	55
Figure 3.3: Available raised bed machinery (a) bed former; note the smearing of bed surface soil and the shallow, rough furrows (insert show furrower) and (b) no till seeder with 8-rows of crop per bed at site A1 (Marinya farm, Cambooya, Australia).....	55
Figure 3.4: On farm head channel with siphons, flow meters, soil moisture data loggers and weather station at site A1 (Marinya farm, Cambooya, Australia).....	56
Figure 3.5: General field conditions and crop stage during measurement at site A2, (Bandawing farm, Dalby, Australia)	58
Figure 3.6: General field conditions of site P2 under corn crop in Mardan, Pakistan (Note that the corn is sown on the edge of the beds to overcome poor penetration of the wetting front, as seen by the wet areas on the surface of the beds)	59
Figure 3.7: Furrow spacing of (a) NB: Narrow bed (b) WB: Wide bed evaluated at three research sites during the benchmarking study in Mardan, Pakistan ..	60
Figure 3.8: Layout of Sentek EnviroSCAN [®] probes placed across half bed width at given positions of sensors for logging soil moisture variations at 10 minutes interval during 2010 wheat season at site A1, Marinya farm, Cambooya, Australia.....	64
Figure 3.9: IRRIMATE [™] equipment for irrigation measurements (a) Siphon flow meter, (b) water advance meter, (c) flume with flow meter.....	66
Figure 4.1: Soil moisture deficit (<i>SMD</i>) in the root zone (0-100cm depth) prior to two irrigation applications at both sites on Vertisol, Australia (vertical bars show SD)	71
Figure 4.2: Average <i>SMD</i> at given depths on three sites, prior to two measured irrigation applications at Mardan, Pakistan (Vertical bars show SD)	71

List of figures

Figure 4.3: Average field measured furrow dimensions (recorded prior to two irrigations at all three sites for narrow bed (NB: 66cm furrow spacing) and wide bed (WB: 132cm furrow spacing) systems at Mardan, Pakistan (vertical bars show SD)	73
Figure 4.4: Average field measured water advance curves of two irrigations at (a) sites A1, and (b) site A2 in Australia (vertical bars show SD)	74
Figure 4.5: Crop and field conditions before (a) irrigation 1 with no cracks; (b) irrigation 2 with flow crossing the bed through cracks at site A2, Australia	74
Figure 4.6: Impact of (a) bed size and (b) wheel trafficking on average water advance along furrow for all three sites in Pakistan (Vertical bars show SD)	76
Figure 4.7: Field conditions of site P2 with (a) NB: Fast water advance on trafficked furrows and slow on non-trafficked alternate furrows; (b) WB: Uniform water advance on both trafficked furrows.....	76
Figure 4.8: Comparison of SIRMOD simulated cumulative infiltration at given times during two irrigations at both sites (A1 and A2) on a Vertisol, in Australia	77
Figure 4.9: Average cumulative infiltration and infiltration opportunity time along the furrow length during the two irrigations at (a) site A1 and (b) site A2 in Australia	78
Figure 4.10: Average volume infiltrated per unit furrow length on two bed sizes at three sites during two irrigations in a sandy clay loam, Pakistan (Vertical bars show SD)	78
Figure 4.11: Average volume infiltrated per unit area on two bed sizes at three sites in sandy clay loam, Pakistan (Vertical bars show SD)	79
Figure 4.12: Spatial variation in average cumulative infiltration along the furrow length to replenish 60 mm soil moisture deficit (<i>SMD</i>) during two irrigations each at (a) site P1, (b) site P2 and (c) site P3 under two bed sizes in sandy clay loam, Pakistan.	79
Figure 5.1: Layout of three PRB renovation methods including (a) NT: no tillage, (b) SC: shallow cultivation and (c) BP: blade ploughing treatments.....	90
Figure 5.2: Establishment of two renovation treatments for 2010 wheat crop after 2009 soybean harvest at site A1, Marinya farm, Cambooya, Australia..	90
Figure 5.3: Layout of bed renovation treatment plots at site A1, Australia	91
Figure 5.4: Overbank systems and IRRIMATE TM meters for measuring inflow rate. Insert shows water advance sensors and soil moisture sensors layout during irrigation. Photo taken during 2010 wheat season at site A1, Cambooya, Australia.....	93
Figure 5.5: In-season variations in furrow dimensions (TW = top width, MW = middle width, BW = bottom width and D = furrow depth) during 2010 wheat season (vertical bars show SD).....	99
Figure 5.6: Average seasonal bulk density of three renovation treatments during three cropping seasons at site A1, Australia (Vertical bars show SDs)	100

Figure 5.7: Average soil moisture deficit in 100 cm depth prior to irrigations during the three seasons (vertical bars show SD).....	101
Figure 5.8: Average cumulative infiltration under (a) freshly applied renovation treatments during 2010 wheat and 2011 corn (average of one irrigation to wheat and two irrigations to corn) crop seasons and (b) un-renovated beds during 2011 hemp season (average of 4 irrigations) at given time at site A1 (Vertical bars show SD).....	102
Figure 5.9: Volumetric soil moisture (100 cm depth) at given distances from furrow centre during irrigation to 2010 wheat crop at site A1, Australia (FC = field capacity)	102
Figure 5.10: Volumetric soil moisture (100 cm depth) at given distance from furrow centre during the first irrigation to 2011 corn at site A1, Australia	103
Figure 5.11: Average daily volumetric water content in 100 cm profile, irrigation applied and rainfall during three cropping seasons under three PRB renovation treatments on a Vertisol. (Vertical bars show SD in irrigations applications between treatments)	104
Figure 5.12: Tillers density (a) and dry biomass (b) for four rows (row 1 on bed shoulder and row 4 on bed middle) of 2010 wheat at site A1(vertical bars show SD).	107
Figure 5.13: Average plant height of three crops on three PRB renovation treatments at site A1, Australia (vertical bars show SD)	108
Figure 5.14: Plant density (a) and dry plant biomass (b) for 2011 hemp three rows (row 1 on bed edge and row 3 on bed middle) across a half bed width for three tillage treatments at site A1, Australia (vertical bars show SD) ..	109
Figure 5.15: Comparative performance of 2011 corn on three PRB renovation treatments at site A1, Australia (vertical bars show SD)	109
Figure 6.1: Experimental set up showing location of four access tubes for micro-gopher across half bed width installed at nine locations (one/treatment) at site A1-Vertisol.	123
Figure 6.2: Average bulk density (BD) before two irrigations for three PRB renovation treatments at site A1, Vertisol (vertical bars show SD)	125
Figure 6.3: Impact of renovation method, wetting time and distance from furrow centre on average soil moisture in 100 cm profile depth during the first irrigation at site A1-Vertisol	126
Figure 6.4: Impact of renovation method, wetting time and distance from furrow centre on average soil moisture in 100 cm profile depth during the second irrigation at site A1-Vertisol	126
Figure 6.5: Change in soil moisture content ($\Delta\theta$) across a 200 cm wide bed at given distances from furrow centre and given times with three renovation treatments during the first irrigation at site A1-Vertisol	128
Figure 6.6: Change in soil moisture content ($\Delta\theta$) across a 200 cm wide bed at given distances from furrow centre and given times with three renovation treatments during the second irrigation at site A1-Vertisol	129

List of figures

Figure 6.7: Cumulative infiltration across a 200 cm wide bed with three renovation treatments during the first irrigation at site A1-Vertisol	130
Figure 6.8: Cumulative infiltration across a 200 cm wide bed with three renovation treatments during the second irrigation at site A1-Vertisol	130
Figure 6.9: Soil moisture distribution for three PRB renovation treatments across a 200 cm wide bed during the first irrigation at site A1-Vertisol	131
Figure 6.10: Soil moisture distribution for three PRB renovation treatments across a 200 cm wide bed during the second irrigation at site A1-Vertisol.....	132
Figure 6.11: Average bulk density (BD) before two irrigations for three PRB renovation treatments at site P4-sandy clay loam (vertical bars show SD)	133
Figure 6.12: Impact of renovation method, wetting time, and distance from furrow centre on average soil moisture in 100 cm profile depth during two irrigations at site P4-sandy clay loam	134
Figure 6.13: Change in soil moisture content ($\Delta\theta$) across a 132 cm wide bed at given distances from furrow centre and given times with three renovation treatments during two irrigations at site P4-sandy clay loam	135
Figure 6.14: Cumulative infiltration across a 132 cm wide bed with three renovation treatments during two irrigations at site P4-sandy clay loam	136
Figure 6.15: Soil moisture distribution for three PRB renovation treatments across a 132 cm wide bed during two irrigations at site P4-sandy clay loam..	137
Figure 6.16: Effect of three PRB renovation methods on average field sorptivity for (a) site A1-Vertisol during first irrigation and (b) site P4-sandy clay loam during two irrigations	138
Figure 7.1: Locations of observation nodes on surface and vertical boundaries of flow domain for Vertisol	145
Figure 7.2: Correlation between measured vs. predicted soil moisture during 9 hrs wetting for three renovation treatments with 9 cm furrow water head .	146
Figure 7.3: Simulated soil moisture variation on the bed surface (shown by observation node number: Figure 7.1) for three PRB renovation treatments with 9 cm furrow water head applied on a Vertisol	147
Figure 7.4: Simulated soil moisture variation on the bed surface at (L1 = 36, L2 = 46, L3 = 51, L4 = 56, L5 = 61 and L6 = 66 cm distance from furrow centre) for three PRB renovation treatments with 9 cm furrow water head applied on a sandy clay loam	147
Figure 7.5: Simulated soil moisture variations below furrow (shown by observation node number: Figure 7.1) for three PRB renovation treatments with 9 cm furrow water head applied on a Vertisol	148
Figure 7.6: Simulated soil moisture variations on the vertical boundary under the bed middle (shown by observation node number: Figure 7.1) for three PRB renovation treatments with 9 cm furrow water head applied on a Vertisol	148

Figure 7.7: Simulated soil moisture variations below furrow (shown by observation node number: Figure 7.1) for three PRB renovation treatments with 9 cm furrow water head applied on a sandy clay loam	149
Figure 7.8: Simulated soil moisture variations on the vertical boundary under the bed middle (shown by observation node number: Figure 7.1) for three PRB renovations with 9 cm furrow water head applied on a sandy clay loam	149
Figure 7.9: Effect of furrow water head on the wetting time required to reach field capacity at different lateral distances from furrow centre on a Vertisol	150
Figure 7.10: Effect of furrow water head on the wetting time required to reach field capacity at different lateral distances from furrow on a sandy clay loam... ..	151
Figure 7.11: Effect of furrow water head and wetting time on the depth of wetting beneath the furrow on a Vertisol	151
Figure 7.12: Effect of furrow water head and wetting time on the depth of wetting beneath the furrow on a sandy clay loam.....	152
Figure 7.13: Effect of furrow water head on simulated cumulative infiltration for three PRB renovation methods on a Vertisol	152
Figure 7.14: Effect of furrow water head on simulated cumulative infiltration for three PRB renovation methods on a sandy clay loam.....	153
Figure 7.15: Effect of wetting time and furrow head on the water stored in 100 cm deep root zone across half bed width for three renovation treatments on a Vertisol.....	154
Figure 7.16: Effect of wetting time and furrow head on the water stored in 100 cm deep root zone across half bed for three renovation treatments on a sandy clay loam	154
Figure 7.17: Effect of wetting time and furrow head on deep drainage losses below 100 cm root zone depth (across half bed x-section) for three PRB renovation methods on a Vertisol.....	155
Figure 7.18: Effect of wetting time and furrow head on deep drainage losses below 100 cm root zone depth (across half bed x-section) for three PRB renovation methods on a sandy clay loam	155
Figure 7.19: Simulated soil moisture distribution across the flow domain after 100 mm water application for three PRB renovation treatments with 9 cm furrow water head on a Vertisol.....	156
Figure 7.20: Simulated soil moisture distribution across the flow domain after 60 mm water application for three PRB renovation treatments with full furrow water head on a sandy clay loam.....	157
Figure 7.21: Effect of inflow rate on furrow water head measured in the field head section during experiments on a Vertisol and a sandy clay loam	158
Figure 7.22: Effect of inflow rate on wetting time of bed middle (200 cm wide bed) to field capacity for three PRB renovation methods on a Vertisol	158

Figure 7.23: Effect of inflow rate on wetting time of bed middle (66 cm furrow spacing-NB) to reach field capacity for three PRB renovation treatments on a sandy clay loam	159
Figure 7.24: Effect of inflow rate on maximum bed width required to ensure wetting of bed middle to field capacity within 7 hrs of wetting time on a sandy clay loam.....	159
Figure 8.1: Impact of optimizing T_{co} at $Er = 85\%$ on the distribution of infiltration opportunity time along the furrow length during two irrigations of 2009 soybean. The dotted box highlights the tail end area susceptible to poor lateral infiltration.....	168
Figure 8.2: Example irrigation management tool for illustrating the optimised T_{co} vs. Q and resulting Ea , Er and DU evaluated for two irrigations at two sites..	169
Figure 8.3: Example irrigation management and field design tool illustrating the effect of furrow length and Q on T_{co} , inflow volume and $T_{co} Ta^{-1}$ (solid lines) and Ea and DU (dotted line) for achieving $Er \geq 85\%$, water reaching furrow tail end on (a) site A1 with blocked end furrows and (b) site A2 with open ended furrows requiring wetting to bed middle on site A1 on Vertisol (vertical bars show SD)	170
Figure 8.4: SIRMOD screen shots for showing the impact of irrigation management strategies on infiltration along a blocked end furrow (86 m) for a high infiltration (site P1-NB during first irrigation) sandy clay loam soil....	171
Figure 8.5: SIRMOD screen shots for showing the impact of irrigation management strategies on infiltration along a blocked end furrow (90 m) for a low infiltration (site P2- NB during first irrigation) sandy clay loam soil...	172
Figure 8.6: Example irrigation management tool showing the effect of inflow rate on optimum time to cut-off for (a) narrow and (b) wide beds with ~90 m furrow length at three sites on a sandy clay loam (vertical bars show SD)	174
Figure 8.7: Impact of irrigation management strategies on performance of (a) over-irrigated events (NB & WB at site P1 and NB at site P3) and (b) under-irrigated events (NB & WB at site P2 and WB at site P3) in a sandy clay loam (vertical bars show SD).....	175
Figure 8.8: Example field design and irrigation management tool illustrating the effect of furrow length and inflow rate on optimised T_{co} and $T_{co} Ta^{-1}$ (solid lines) and Ea and DU (dotted lines) for (a) narrow beds (66 cm furrow spacing) and (b) wide beds (132 cm furrow spacing) in a sandy clay loam. Optimisation required $Er \geq 85\%$ and water reaching to the tail end).....	176
Figure 8.9: Impact of renovation methods and Q on optimal T_{co} and inflow volume (solid lines) and Ea and DU (dotted line) on (a) one season old PRBs (2010 wheat) (b) three season old PRBs (2011 corn) at site A1, Australia. Optimisation requires wetting of bed middle and accounts for furrow water head effect on lateral infiltration	180

Figure 8.10: Example field design and irrigation management tool for showing the effect of furrow length and Q on optimum Tco & Inflow volume (solid lines) and Ea & DU (dotted lines). Optimisation data for a single irrigation to 2010 wheat requiring lateral wetting of bed middle on a Vertisol at site A1, Australia	181
Figure 8.11: Example field design and irrigation management tool for showing the effect of furrow length and Q on optimum Tco & Inflow volume (solid lines) and Ea & DU (dotted lines). Optimisation data for two irrigations on a 2011 corn crop requiring $Er \geq 85\%$ and water reaching to furrow tail ends at site A1, Australia.....	182
Figure 8.12: Effect of furrow length on optimum Tco Ta^{-1} (solid line) and Ea (dotted line) for freshly renovated PRBs (2010 wheat season) for different Q and requiring wetting of bed middle at site A1, Australia..	182
Figure A1: Average water advance distance along furrow vs. square root of time during two irrigations (I1 = irrigation 1 and I2 = irrigation 2) for (a) site A1 and A2 on a Vertisol, Australia and (b) site P1, P2 and P3 on a sandy clay loam, Pakistan.....	229
Figure A2: Temporal variations in bulk density and soil moisture for 0-30 cm profile of three PRB renovation treatments during two cropping seasons (2010 wheat and 2011 hemp) seasons at site A1, Australia (vertical bars show SD)	230
Figure A3: Impact of three fresh renovation methods and irrigation management on water advance rate along furrow during single irrigation to wheat crop (a) and two irrigations to corn crop (b) at site A1, Australia.....	231
Figure A4: Impact of SMD (low during irrigation 1 & 2 and high during irrigation 3 & 4) on water advance rate along furrow during four irrigations to 2011 hemp crop under three PRB renovation treatments (one season old) at site A1, Australia	232
Figure B1: Measured vs. simulated water advance times along furrow length during two irrigations at (a) site A1 and (b) site A2 in Australia.....	233
Figure B2: Measured vs. simulated water advance times along furrow length at three sites under both (NB and WB) bed sizes in Mardan, Pakistan	234
Figure B3: Measured vs. simulated water advance times along furrow length of the fresh PRB renovation treatments during three cropping seasons at site A1, Australia	235
Figure C1: Volumetric soil moisture in 0-30 cm at 10 cm depth interval measured gravimetrically vs. volumetric soil moisture measure with calibrated Sentek enviroSCAN across bed during three cropping seasons	236
Figure C2: Volumetric soil moisture in 0-30 cm at 10 cm depth interval measured gravimetrically vs. volumetric soil moisture measured with calibrated Micro-Gopher (measured before and after irrigation during 2011 corn crop experiments) across bed under (a) Vertisol, Australia and (b) sandy clay loam, Pakistan.....	236

Figure D1: Example irrigation management tool showing the effect of inflow rate on optimum time to cut-off on irrigation performance (Ea and DU) by confirming $Er \geq 85\%$ for two bed sizes (NB & WB) with 86-90 m furrow length at three sites on a sandy clay loam (vertical bars show SD)	242
Figure D2: Example field design and irrigation management tool showing the effect of furrow length and inflow rate on optimum Tco , inflow volume and $Tco Ta^{-1}$ (solid lines) and; Ea and DU (dotted lines) for narrow beds (66 cm furrow spacing), by confirming $Er \geq 85\%$ and water reaching tail end with 60 mm SMD , at given three sites in a sandy clay loam, at Mardan, Pakistan (Vertical bars show SD).....	242
Figure D3: Example field design and irrigation management tool showing the effect of furrow length and inflow rate on optimum Tco , inflow volume and $Tco Ta^{-1}$ (solid lines) and Ea and DU (dotted lines) for wide beds (132 cm furrow spacing) by confirming $Er \geq 85\%$ and water reaching to tail end with 60 mm SMD , at given three sites in a sandy clay loam, at Mardan, Pakistan (vertical bars show SD)	243
Figure E1: Flow domain x-sections for Hydrus 2D calibration on two soils. The notch at the top right side is a furrow with positions marked for measured furrow dimensions.....	246
Figure E2: Material distribution in (a) shallow cultivation, and (b) blade plough renovation treatments in both soils.....	246
Figure E3: Outline of flow domain with applied boundary conditions.....	248
Figure E4: Comparison of measured (solid line) vs. predicted (dotted line) cumulative infiltration at four given distances from furrow centre for three PRB renovation methods at 9 cm furrow water head on a Vertisol... ..	251
Figure E5: Comparison of measured (solid line) vs. predicted (dotted line) cumulative infiltration at three given distances from furrow centre for three PRB renovation methods at 9 cm furrow water head on a sandy clay loam.....	251

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Research plan for improving water productivity of raised beds	51
Table 3.2: Summary of experimental sites, objectives, field conditions and measurements (SM = soil moisture , BD = bulk density, SCL= sandy clay loam and three treatments are described in Chapter 5)	62
Table 3.3: Input and output data of IPARM and SIRMOD models	65
Table 4.1: Experimental details of measurement of existing irrigation performance in Australia and Pakistan (SM-soil moisture, BD- bulk density and <i>SMD</i> -soil moisture deficit, FC- Field capacity, NB-narrow bed and WB-wide bed).....	68
Table 4.2: Average furrow dimensions (TW = top width, MW = middle width, BW = bottom width and D = depth) recorded prior to two irrigations at two sites (A1 and A2) in Australia and three sites (P1, P2 and P3) in Pakistan (SD in brackets).....	72
Table 4.3: Average irrigation performance of two irrigations measured on two sites (A1 and A2 with two bed sizes) in south east Queensland, Australia and three sites (P1, P2 and P3 with two bed sizes) in north west Pakistan (SD in brackets)	75
Table 4.4: Volume of surface water storage in furrows at the time of water arrival to tail end on three sites with two bed sizes in sandy clay loam, Pakistan (SD in brackets).....	81
Table 5.1: Soil tillage applied to each treatment over three cropping seasons at site A1	91
Table 5.2: Experimental details of measurement of soil properties, irrigation, crop yield and water productivity per each PRB renovation plot during three cropping seasons at site A1, Australia (SM = soil moisture, BD = bulk density).	96
Table 5.3: Average furrow dimensions (according to layouts shown in Figure 3.2c) under three PRB renovation treatments during each cropping seasons (SD in brackets)	99
Table 5.4: Total water applied (<i>TWA</i>) during the three cropping seasons in three PRB renovation methods at site A1, Cambooya Australia.	105
Table 5.5: Irrigation performance for freshly applied PRB renovation treatments during two cropping seasons (2010 wheat & 2011 corn) and on un-renovated PRB (2011 hemp) treatments at site A1, Australia (SD in brackets)	106
Table 5.6: Average dry plant biomass for three crops and dry grain yield for 2011 corn with three PRB renovation methods at site A1, Australia (SD in brackets)	108
Table 5.7: Dry biomass input water productivity of three crops under three PRB renovation methods at site A1, Australia.	110
Table 5.8: Dry grain input water productivity of 2011 corn under three PRB renovation methods at site A1, Australia.	110

Table 6.1: Average furrow dimensions during two irrigations on a Vertisol and a sandy clay loam (furrow dimensions explained in Figure 3.2c), (SD in brackets)	121
Table 6.2: Wetting front penetration (in cm from furrow centre) at the bed surface after 9 hrs of wetting for three treatments during the first irrigation at site A1-Vertisol.....	130
Table 6.3: Wetting front penetration (in cm from furrow centre) at the bed surface after 9 hrs of wetting for three renovation treatments during the two irrigation at site P4-sandy clay loam	136
Table 6.4: Field sorptivity ($\text{mm hr}^{-0.5}$) during 9 hrs wetting time for three PRB renovation treatments during the first irrigation at site A1-Vertisol and average of two irrigations at site P4-sandy clay loam (SD in brackets)	138
Table 7.1: Time required for the wetting front to reach the given positions on the two soils with three PRB renovation methods at 9 cm furrow water head applied	149
Table 8.1: Average irrigation performance parameters for strategies of optimising (i) time to cut-off (T_{co}) and (ii) inflow rate (Q) plus T_{co} compared with field measured farmer practice (FP) for two sites (site A1 = 465 m long furrows with blocked tail ends and site A2 = 455 m long furrows with open end furrows at tail end) evaluated during two irrigation events on a Vertisol (SD in brackets).....	167
Table 8.2: Average irrigation performance parameters for strategies of optimising (i) time to cut-off (T_{co}) and (ii) inflow rate (Q) plus T_{co} compared with field measured farmer practice (FP) for two bed sizes evaluated during two irrigation events (~90 m furrow length) on a sandy clay loam (SD in brackets)	173
Table 8.3: Impact of three fresh PRB renovation methods and optimised (Q and T_{co}) on irrigation performance during two cropping seasons on Vertisol (SD in brackets).....	178
Table 8.4: Impact of one season old renovation methods and the optimised (Q and T_{co}) on irrigation performance across all experimental plots during the 2011 hemp season (SD in brackets)	179
Table A 1: Soil properties at given depths at site A1, Australia (Soil analysis conducted by Topoclimate services Pty Ltd)	223
Table A 2: Soil properties at given depths on two bed sizes measured at the harvest of wheat 2008-09 crop at site P1, Pakistan.	223
Table A3: Average monthly weather data at site A1 during four cropping seasons (SD in brackets).....	224
Table A4: Average bed furrow dimensions measured before irrigations during the benchmarking study in both soils and three renovation experiments in Australia (TW = top width, MW = middle width, BW = Bottom width and D = furrow depth).....	225
Table A5: Average water advance and variability during the benchmarking study	226

Table A6:	Temporal variation in average bulk density (BD in gm cm^{-3}) and soil moisture (SM in %) of 0-30 cm profile at 10 cm interval for three PRB renovation treatments during three cropping seasons in a Vertisol, Australia (SD in brackets).....	227
Table D1:	Existing irrigation performance of raised beds and deep drainage losses (DD) during two irrigations on two sites in south east Queensland, Australia (SD in brackets).....	237
Table D2:	Existing irrigation performance of raised beds and deep drainage losses (DD) during two irrigations on three sites with two bed sizes in north west Pakistan (SD in brackets).....	237
Table D3:	Average irrigation performance for all irrigation events applied on three PRB renovation methods during three cropping seasons on a Vertisol at site A1, Australia (SD in brackets).....	238
Table D4:	Average seasonal irrigation performance for three PRB renovation methods during three cropping seasons on a Vertisol at site A1, Australia (SD in brackets).....	239
Table D5:	Effect of two irrigation management optimisation strategies on current irrigation performance of three sites with two bed sizes during two irrigations under sandy clay loam during benchmarking study in Mardan, Pakistan (SD in brackets)	240
Table D6:	Effect of two irrigation management optimisation strategies on current irrigation performance of three PRB renovation treatments during three cropping seasons on Vertisol at site A1, Australia (SD in brackets)	241
Table E1:	Soil hydraulic parameters for the analytical functions of Van Genuchten equation after calibrating the Hydrus 2D model according to the measured field conditions (Units for time (t) = hr and length (l) = cm).....	245
Table E2:	Field measured furrow dimensions (TW = top width, BW = bottom width and D = depth of furrow) during experiments conducted on Vertisol and sandy clay loam.....	245
Table E3:	Antecedent soil moisture and soil moisture deficit (SMD) in 100 cm root zone depth in Vertisol and 60 cm depth in sandy clay loam.....	247
Table E4:	Relationship between measured and predicted soil moisture at given times and depths across the bed on a Vertisol at 6 cm furrow water head (R^2 values in %).	249
Table E5:	Relationship between measured and predicted soil moisture at given times and depths on Vertisol at 9 cm furrow water head (R^2 values in %).	250
Table E6:	Relationship between measured and predicted soil moisture at given times and depths across bed on sandy clay loam soil at 9 cm furrow water head (R^2 in %)	250

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACIAR	Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research
BD	bulk density
BP	blade ploughing
BW	bottom width of furrow
CA	conservation agriculture
CTF	control traffic farming
D	depth of furrow
<i>DD</i>	deep drainage losses
<i>DU</i>	distribution uniformity
<i>Ea</i>	application efficiency
<i>Er</i>	requirement efficiency
FC	field capacity
MW	middle width of furrow
NB	narrow bed (66 cm furrow spacing)
NCEA	National Centre for Engineering in Agriculture
NT	no tillage
PARC	Pakistan Agricultural Research Council
PRB	Permanent raised bed
Qld	Queensland
SC	shallow cultivation
SD	standard deviation
SM	soil moisture
<i>SMD</i>	soil moisture deficit
<i>Ta</i>	time of irrigation water advance to furrow tail end
<i>Tco</i>	time to cut-off
TW	top width of furrow
WB	wide bed (132 cm furrow spacing)
WP	wetted perimeter
<i>WP</i>	input water productivity

LIST OF SYMBOLS

A	cross sectional area of flow
a	Kostiakov infiltration exponent
D_f	diffusivity
f_o	steady state infiltration rate of the soil
g	acceleration due to gravity
I	infiltration rate
k	Kostiakov infiltration equation coefficient
Q	inflow rate
r	fitted parameter
S	sorptivity
S_f	frictional slope
S_o	furrow slope
v	flow velocity
y	furrow water head
Z	cumulative infiltration
θ	volumetric soil moisture content
ρ_b	bulk density
ρ_s	particle density
σ_y	surface storage shape factor
σ_z	subsurface storage coefficient
F	scaling factor
ϕ	boltzman transform
Ψ	soil moisture potential